BLM LIBRARY
88031179

Gordon

BREIFING PACKAGE

A SYSTEM FOR WORKLOAD ANALYSIS IN UTAH

Management Project for the
Management and Leadership Workshop
Prepared by James G. Kenna
Submitted 6/19/86

#28789111 D-5803111

HF
5549.5
.M3
K465
1986

BLM LIBRARY
SC-653, BLDG. 50
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P. O. BOX 25047
DENVER, CO 80225-0047

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Management Summary of the Project	2
The System for Workload Analysis	5
Draft Workload Categories	10
Budget Use of Workload Analysis	21
Personnel Management and Workload Analysis	25

Management Project
James G. Kenna

A SYSTEM FOR WORKLOAD ANALYSIS IN UTAH

BLM in Utah is required to perform work and track expenditures in a large number of subactivities. There is a similarly large number of diverse authorizations, public concerns, facilities, types of areas affected and problems encountered. For line managers attempting to evaluate alternative allocations of dollars to different offices, staffs and programs, the large number of possible combinations can prevent clear understanding of relative workloads.

Because BLM programs in Utah are sufficiently complex to prevent quick workload analysis, a systematic and objective approach is needed in order to identify the base program for decision makers.

GOAL: To provide the State Director/Associate State Director (by 12/19/86) with an easy-to-use, field tested, systematic and objective approach for analyzing the relative workloads of resource areas and districts in Utah. To accomplish this, the following project objectives have been identified:

1. Develop, define and scale workload measures for 4322, 4332, 4333 and 4712.

2. Test workload measures for 4332, 4333 and 4712 against Moab District data.

3. Test workload measures for 4322 against statewide data. (4322 was chosen for the statewide test because I have no direct involvement in the program (impartiality) and because the program is distributed across all RAs in Utah.)

4. Develop and define draft workload measures for all other subactivities used in Utah.

5. Produce a written report on the workload analysis system developed. The report would include:

   a. Goals and objectives for the system
   b. A description of the system
   c. Options for complete implementation of the system
   d. Uses for the system
   e. Analysis of advantages and disadvantages
   f. Recommendations

The desired benefits are better information on which to base decisions, improved placement of funding, better management of personnel and improved organizational structure in times of reduced budgets.

The workload measure approach proposed would develop a system of numerical ratings by subactivity. The ratings would be based upon 3 to 8 key workload categories scaled and weighted based on 1) the amount of work generated and 2) the importance of the work. Workload measures would be developed or reviewed by ad hoc working groups composed of program leaders around the state and/or Assistant District Managers. All workload measures must be objectively measureable and would be required to fit one of the following generalized concepts:

1. Number of discreet authorizations
2. Number of public land users
3. Number of administrative units
4. Amount of use
5. Periodicity of use
6. Size of the affected area
7. Degree of presence of a given resource
8. Objective evidence of investment in current management approach
9. Objective evidence of special significance
10. Capital investment that is BLM's responsibility to maintain
11. Effect of management on public safety
12. Degree to which an unauthorized use problem exists

The intent of the system would be to focus on those areas where the majority of the workload is generated and find the most expedient and representative measure of the work itself (not the way in which it is handled). Not all work would be measured directly. In order to avoid an overly complex and unuseable system, no attempt would be made to measure the amount of work done. The system would provide relative measures.

The workload measure system is not intended to make decisions. It would provide an objective and consistently developed approximation of relative workloads. Managers could use the information to begin assessing options in the decision making process, particularly in budgeting and position management. The system could also help identify managers who are performing at a high level of efficiency.

Development and implementation of a system of this nature is likely to meet resistance based on concern about any change or perceived change which may result from its use. For this reason it must be emphasized that improved workload analysis can only help Utah BLM to identify and make the changes necessary to meet Reform 88/ Graham-Rudman-Hollings. Identifying needed changes sooner will allow more gradual adjustments resulting in less adversity to employees and improved ability to maintain service to the public in those areas which are most important.

Because management is faced with allocating diminishing budgets and positions to alternative offices and workloads, a more comprehensive and systematic evaluation of workload across the state is needed. This project would be directed toward meeting that need.

PROPOSED TIME LINE

	ITEM	COMPLETION
1.	Complete Concept Development with ADM	6/ 2/86
2.	Get decision on approach to system development/implementation	6/30/86
3.	Complete development of workload measures and approach to data gathering	8/ 1/86
4.	Complete data gathering for the state	9/15/86
5.	Complete preliminary scaling of workload measures	10/30/86
6.	Complete testing against statewide and district data	12/ 1/86
7.	Evaluate project with SD and ASD; send memo accepting project	12/19/86

RESOURCES NEEDED

1. The most important need is management team support of the importance of developing a system for improved workload analysis.

2. The number of work months devoted to the project is dependent on which of the following approaches is selected in developing the system.

   a. Management directed implementation. Together with assigned project mentors, I would develop the workload measures and USO would require submission of data for completing the analysis.
   .....Estimate 3 to 5 WMs spread over Utah

   b. Development by concensus. Workload measures would be developed by ad hoc work groups made up of people from all the districts. Data would also be developed by each of the districts and submitted to USO.
   .....Estimate 4 to 6 WMs statewide together with some additional travel for coordination and final concensus meetings

   c. Accelerated development. This would require additional WMs to be devoted to the project because tasks which otherwise could have been accomplished during nonwork hours would need to be accomplished during work hours.

3. Input will be needed from some managers and staff specialists around the state in developing, or responding to, workload measures and their scaling.

Wang 0023A
JKenna;jgk 5/14/86

A SYSTEM FOR WORKLOAD ANALYSIS

This section outlines a system to aid line managers in comparing the relative work loads of resource areas and districts across Utah. The desired result is tool to aid managers in the placement of funding and the management of positions in times of reduced budgets. Issues related to why a system of the type proposed is needed are discussed briefly, followed by goals and objectives for the proposed system and a description of the proposed system. Implementation of the system is discussed last.

I. ISSUES

A. WHY IS BETTER WORKLOAD ANALYSIS NEEDED?

1. There is insufficient objective information, organized in a systematic fashion, on the statewide workload. As a result, there is not a common understanding among managers of a) what the best indicators of workload are (in some subactivities) or b) how much of the workload is located in the various offices around the state.

2. The statewide workload is too large complex to evaluate effectively without a systematic overview of all subactivities.

3. There is no consistency in our methods of evaluating workload among offices or across subactivities.

4. Some analyses incorporate subjective judgements by program leaders before they are presented to line managers.

5. Some analyses of major programs may oversimplify by relying on too few (1 to 3) factors in evaluating workload.

6. Some analyses are done subjectively or by using vague generalities. This method is not credible or verifiable.

7. Better information leads to better decisions.

B. WHAT ADVANTAGES DOES THE PROPOSED SYSTEM HAVE OVER PREVIOUS EFFORTS?

Because there have been previous efforts in BLM to come up with a good way of doing workload analysis, the following indicates why the proposed approach represents a useful innovation.

1. It is designed to be operational. It will not produce an elegant, analytical model steeped in detail or dedicated to exactness. It will put the manager "into the ballpark" quickly.

2. It is a tool which will allow managers to make approximate workload comparisons using simple computations (addition and setting up ratios).

3. It deliberately avoids becoming mired in detail by focusing on a limited number of factors in evaluating a subactivity. At the same time, the system allows evaluation of a sufficient number of factors to fairly represent the workload in major programs.

4. It is simple to use because it relies on relative measures and indicators rather than trying to measure amounts of work performed, the way work is handled or the relationship of work to plans.

5. It can be applied to all offices and subactivities consistently and objectively. Upon understanding the system, line managers can use the information and apply those subjective adjustments which are appropriate.

6. It provides a boiled down view of the statewide workload allowing the manager to grasp the interrelationships among offices.

II. GOAL

To establish an accurate measure of the relative size of program workloads in Utah, by office and subactivity, within 3 years of initiation.

III. SYSTEM OBJECTIVES

The system must:

1. Be simple to use and objective in measuring workload indicators.

2. Provide for line manager tracking of workload changes in the base program over time.

3. Provide consistency in the approach to workload analysis across offices and subactivities.

4. Not cost more to use, once implemented, than present approaches.

6. Work through objective comparisons among offices (relative measurement).

7. Limit the workload measure categories to the 3 to 8 major quantifiable components which are indicative of the overall workload in each subactivity.

The system should:

1. Be easy for managers to use and understand once it is in place.

2. Define any workload measure subject to interpretation, in order to establish common understanding.

3. Be resistant to tendencies to inflate or deflate workload represented.

4. Weight the different workload categories within a subactivity in order not to over- or underrepresent the work generated.

5. Eliminate broad and vague descriptions of work as a basis for discussion.

6. Not attempt to replace or modify FMS reportable units.

7. Not attempt to make decisions, actual or implied.

IV. THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

Workload analysis for a subactivity would be developed using resource area data. Each district would be considered to be the sum of its resource areas' ratings for any given subactivity.

Between 3 and 8 workload categories would be identified for each subactivity used in Utah. These would focus on those areas indicating the amount of work generated or its importance. In identifying the categories, consideration would be given to their appropriateness in making meaningful comparisons and to how well they can be objectively measured. It may be necessary, in some subactivities to set thresholds such as "No workload category will be measured which represents less than 10% of the statewide program", in order to avoid generating too many categories.

The following generalized concepts would be used to develop workload categories in all subactivities:

1. Number of discreet authorizations
2. Number of public land users
3. Number of administrative units
4. Amount of use
5. Periodicity of use
6. Size of the affected area
7. Degree of presence of a given resource
8. Evidence of investment in current management approach
9. Evidence of special significance
10. Capital investment that is BLM's responsibility to maintain
11. Effect of management on public safety
12. Degree to which an unauthorized use problem exists

In many cases the workload measure will not measure all work directly. For example, use authorizations would include the associated compliance workload for all activities. In addition, workload measured may not all occur at one office level. As an example, a district composed of resource areas with large number of producing wells or units would need to do a relatively large number of KGS determinations. Again, the intent is to get an accurate picture of relative workload across the state.

Measurements of how work is handled, such as numbers of environmental assessments or compliance checks, would be avoided. These items vary significantly and are, in practice, affected by available personnel, management style, etc.

Any workload category or measure which is subject to differing interpretations would be defined. Many categories may not need definitions (e.g. number of special recreation permits), while others may require only a simple limitation (AUMs: active preference only).

The relative importance of different categories within a subactivity may be represented through weighting the number of points assigned in each category. Care must be taken to ensure that points assigned for a given workload in one category do not over- or underrepresent the work generated when compared with other categories in the same subactivity.

In all cases, the workload measure must be quantifiable and sufficiently well defined so that the data gathered is consistent. Each workload measure would then be scaled based upon the smallest and largest data submissions (from the resource areas) in each workload category. Much of the information is expected to be available from existing statistics and reports already kept by various offices in the state or by the DSC.

Once the data is collected and scaling between the the largest and the smallest workloads is complete, points assigned to the appropriate bracketed line within all the categories for a subactivity would be added to arrive at a summary rating for that program in any resource area. Comparisons among offices may be made by comparing the summary ratings in any subactivity. Changes in workload may be tracked by changes in the various workload categories.

A draft of the workload categories for many subactivities, some of which are scaled, is attached.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

	ITEM	COMPLETION
1.	Complete Concept Development with ADM	6/ 2/86
2.	Get decision on approach to system development/implementation	6/30/86
3.	Complete development of workload measures and approach to data gathering	8/ 1/86
4.	Complete data gathering for the state	9/15/86
5.	Complete preliminary scaling of workload measures	10/30/86
6.	Complete testing against statewide and district data	12/ 1/86
7.	Evaluate project with SD and ASD; send memo accepting project	12/19/86

There are 2 possible options in developing the system.

a. Management directed implementation. Together with assigned project mentors, I would develop the workload measures and USO would require submission of data for completing the analysis.
.....Estimate 3 to 5 WMs spread over Utah

b. Development by concensus. Workload measures would be developed by ad hoc work groups made up of people from all the districts. Data would also be developed by each of the districts and submitted to USO.
.....Estimate 4 to 6 WMs statewide together with some additional travel for coordination and final concensus meetings

At least some input will be needed from some managers and staff specialists around the state regardless of the option chosen. Managers are more likely to feel committed to the system the more of a role they have in developing it.

Wang 0033A
JKenna;jgk 6/18/86

DRAFT WORKLOAD CATEGORIES

4111--OIL AND GAS

1. Number of Notices/Permits for Geophysical
2. Number of Miles of Geophysical Line Per Year (3 Year Average)
3. Number of Sundry Notices Processed Per Year (3 Year Average)
4. Number of Lease Inspections Per Year (3 Year Average)
5. Number of Producing Wells
6. Number of APDs processed Per Year (3 Year Average)
7. Number of Abandonments Per Year (3 Year Average)
8. Number of INCs Issued Per Year (3 Year Average)

4121--COAL

1. Number of Resource Recovery and Protection Plans Submitted (3 Year Average)
   NOTE: Includes bond and maximum economic recovery review
2. Number of Lease Modifications Processed (3 Year Average)
3. Number of Lease Readjustments Processed (3 Year Average)
4. Number of Quarterly Inspections (1 Per Active Lease Per Quarter)
   NOTE: Includes lease terms, reclamation, R2P2 and abandonment
5. Number of Monthly Product Verifications (Volumetrics; 1 Per Active Mine Per Month)
6. Number of Yearly Audits (1 Per Active Mine Per Year)
7. Number of INCs Issued (3 Year Average)
8. Number of Inactive Lease Inspections (# Leases)
9. Number of Exploration Drillholes Completed (3 Year Average)

4122--TAR SANDS

1. Number of Exploration Drillholes Completed
2. Number of Mine Plan Reviews Completed
3. Number of Lease Modifications
4. Number of Lease Readjustments
5. Number of Designated Special Tar Sands Areas

4131--MINERAL MATERIALS

1. Number of Noncompetive Sales and Free Use Permits (3 Year Average)
2. Number of Acres Affected By Sales (3 Year Average)
3. Number of Competitive Sales (3 Year Average)
4. Number of Community Pits Permitted (3 Year Average)
5. Number of Trespass Cases (Last 3 Years)

4132--MINING LAW ADMINISTRATION

1. Number of Notices Processed (3 Year Average)
2. Number of Plans of Operation Processed (3 Year Average)
3. Number of Validity Determinations (3 Year Average)

4211-- RIGHTS OF WAY

1. Number of Reappraisals Scheduled
2. Number of Reviews Scheduled
3. Number of Compliance Checks Scheduled
4. Number of Incoming Cases (3 Year Average)
5. Number of Trespass Cases (Last 3 Years)

4212--OTHER LANDS

1. Number of Sales (3 Year Average; Serialized Cases)
2. Number of R&PP (3 Year Average; Cases)
3. Number of Exchanges (3 Year Average; Cases)
4. Number of Land Use Leases and Permits (3 Year Average)
5. Acreage in State Selections (Last 3 Years)
6. Acreage in State Exchanges (Last 3 Years)
7. Number of Desert Land Entry Cases (3 Year Average)
8. Number of Trespass Cases (3 Year Total)

4321--WILD HORSES AND BURROS
(bureauwide scale for example purposes only)

	Workload Measure	Points
1. Number of Herd Areas	10 or more	10
	9	9
	8	8
	7	7
	6	6
	5	5
	4	4
	3	3
	2	2
	1	1
2. Acreage of Herd Areas	800,000 or over	10
	700,000 to 799,999	9
	600,000 to 699,999	8
	500,000 to 599,999	7
	400,000 to 499,999	6
	300,000 to 399,999	5
	200,000 to 299,999	4
	100,000 to 199,999	3
	50,000 to 99,999	2
	Less than 50,000	1
3. Current Number of Horses	Over 10,000	10
	8,000 to 10,000	9
	6,000 to 7,999	8
	5,000 to 5,999	7
	4,000 to 4,999	6
	3,000 to 3,999	5
	2,000 to 2,999	4
	1,000 to 1,999	3
	100 to 999	2
	Less than 100	1

4. Number of Horses Over Management Level (from the land use plan)

More than 8000	10
7000 to 7999	9
6000 to 6999	8
5000 to 5999	7
4000 to 4999	6
3000 to 3999	5
2000 to 2999	4
500 to 1999	3
50 to 499	2
Fewer than 50	1

5. Horses to Be Removed From Private Land (Current or Continuing)

Yes	10
No	0

6. Number of Years Since The Last Inventory

5	10
4	7
3	5
2	3
1	0

7. Is a Herd Is Smaller Than 200 and Threatened by Poaching, Disease, Inbreeding or Harrassment?

Yes	5
No	1

4322--RANGE

1. Number of permittees

Workload Measure	Points
Over 500	10
300 to 499	9
200 to 299	8
175 to 199	7
150 to 174	6
130 to 149	5
110 to 129	4
80 to 109	3
50 to 79	2
Fewer than 50	1

2. Number of Allotments

3. Number of I Category Allotments

4. Number of Licenses/Permits Issued (3 Year Average)

Over 500	10
400 to 499	9
350 to 400	8
300 to 349	7
250 to 299	6
200 to 249	5
150 to 199	4
100 to 149	3
50 to 99	2
Fewer than 50	1

5. Number of AUMs licensed

6. Percentage of AUMs Licensed by Quarter (Seasonality)

Over 20% in 4 Quarters	10
Over 20% in 3 Quarters	7
Over 20% in 2 Quarters	5
Any 1 Quarter Less Than 10%	4
Any 2 Quarters Less Than 10%	3
Over 20% in Only 1 Quarter	2
All AUMs in 1 Quarter	1

7. Number of Activity Plans Approved But Not Yet Implemented

8. Number of Trespass Cases (3 Year Average)

10	10
9	9
8	8
7	7
6	6
5	5
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1

NOTE: Use RMAS

4341--SOIL, AIR AND WATER

1. Number of Public Water Systems Operated by BLM
2. Number of Air Quality/Climate Monitoring Stations Operated by BLM
3. Number of Stream Gage/Water Quality Stations Operated By BLM
4. Number of Water Quality Point/Nonpoint Sources Identified
5. Number of Water Rights Documents Filings (3 Year Average)
6. Number of Miles of Perrenial Stream
7. Number of Acres of Soil Survey to be Done
8. Number of Dam Sites Under the Dam Safety Program
9. Number of Acres of Wetland (Do Not Duplicate Streams Counted)

4331-CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Number of BLM clearances per year
2. Number of National Landmarks
3. Number of National Register Properties
4. Site density relative to acres inventoried

4332-WILDERNESS

1. Number of Acres of designated wilderness
2. Number of acres subject to IMP
3. Number of IMP actions per year (3 year average)

4333--RECREATION
Done By SRMA

	Workload Measure	Points
1. Visitor Safety (3 Year Total)		
	3 or more deaths	10
	1 to 3 deaths	8
	3 or more serious injuries	5
	1 to 3 serious injuries	3
	Some risk or safety concern	2
	Little risk or safety concern	1
2. Visitor Hours (amount of use)		
	Over 900,000	10
	750,001 to 900,000	9
	650,001 to 750,000	8
	550,001 to 650,000	7
	450,001 to 550,000	6
	350,001 to 450,000	5
	250,001 to 350,000	4
	150,001 to 250,000	3
	50,001 to 150,000	2
	Fewer than 50,000	1
3. Visits (# people)		
	Over 100,000	10
	85,001 to 100,000	9
	70,001 to 85,000	8
	60,001 to 70,000	7
	50,001 to 60,000	6
	40,001 to 50,000	5
	30,001 to 40,000	4
	20,001 to 30,000	3
	10,001 to 20,000	2
	Fewer than 10,000	1
4. User Demand		
	Reservation system and rationing used	10
	Reservation system or rationing used	5
	No reservation system or rationing used	1

5. Designations

Congressional Designation	10
Secretarial Designation	6
State Director or District Manager	3
No Special Designations	1

6. Permit Fees Collected

Over $64,000	10
$32,001 to $64,000	9
$16,001 to $32,000	8
$8,001 to $16,000	7
$4,001 to $8,000	6
$2,001 to $4,000	5
$1,001 to $2,000	4
$501 to $1,000	3
$101 to $500	2
Less than $10	1

7. Investment in Current Management

Covered by completed Activity Plan, Federal Register published management procedures and the land use plan	10
Covered by 2 of the above	7
Covered by 1 of the above	4
Covered by none of the above	1

8. Capital Improvements (Current Replacement Cost-4712?)

Over $2,500,000	10
$2,000,001 to $2,500,000	9
$1,600,001 to $2,000,000	8
$1,200,001 to $1,600,000	7
$800,001 to $1,200,000	6
$400,001 to $800,000	5
$200,001 to $400,000	4
$50,001 to $200,000	3
$1,001 to $50,000	2
Less than $1,000	1

4351--WILDLIFE

1. Management Plans completed (active)

2. Critical Range for deer(1-5 for acres; 1-5 for # of ranges; usually winter range)

3. Elk (as for deer; usually winter)

4. Moose (as for deer; wetland areas, winter range)

5. Bibhorn Sheep (as for deer; lambing areas)

6. Antelope (as for deer; fawning areas)

7. Hunter Days for Upland Game Species

8. Acres of Wetland and Riparian Habitat

9. Miles of stream supporting a sport fishery

10. Number of documented raptor nests

4352--T&E SPECIES

1. Number of Animal Species Federal or State Listed

2. Number of actions requiring field clearances and written documentation (staff report, description in an EA)

3. Number of formal consultations with FWS

4. Acres of designated critical habitat (FWS or state; no double count)

5. Number of designated critical habitat areas

6. Number of Management Plans in which the featured species is T&E (Active)

BUDGET USE OF WORKLOAD ANALYSIS

The well-being of BLM, and that of the public it serves, depends upon efficient use of available budget. Toward this end, annual work planning must direct those resources to where they will be most cost effective in accomplishing measureable work and tangible services for the public.

A. Flaws in the present AWP approach and its execution which could be addressed by this application of the proposed workload analysis are:

1. There is a tendency to code time where the money is rather than where the work is. Work continues in subactivities where funding is no longer available and there are incentives not to overspend where the work is important but the money has run out. (These same problem applies to expenditures for fixed costs and procurement.) This approach to cost coding inaccurately depicts the base program in Utah.

2. There are no incentives for line managers to turn unneeded funding back, to phase out excess positions, to consider using other than full time positions to accomplish work, to design positions based on the most efficient allocation of work or otherwise to improve the cost efficiency of the overall program when needed.

3. Managers and employees have resisted objective comparisons among offices, feeling they do not represent a total picture.

4. Program leaders are, in many cases, making funding decisions for line officials.

5. Managers are sometimes given directives to accomplish without the means to accomplish them.

6. AWP directives often are broad and vague.

7. The AWP is funded from the top down rather than built from the bottom up. Offices and functions directly responsible for issuing permits, implementing projects, processing APDs and contracts, staffing the public room, etc. should be considered first in evaluating the basic program needs for the state.

8. There is at least a perception that some present AWP decisions are not based on rational, objective or identifiable considerations related to the relative importance of work to be done.

The significance of the problem can be stated simply. Where lack of information results in poor AWP decisions, public service and work accomplished suffer.

B. GOAL: To base the Utah PAWP/AWP on objective workload measures within 3 years of initiation of the proposed system or one similar to it.

C. OBJECTIVES:

1. Be easy for managers to use and understand once it is in place.

2. Promote prioritization of work close to the level it is performed.

3. Provide sufficient flexibility to allow funding of workload which is not part of the normal base program identified by workload analysis.

4. Provide opportunity for line managers to code time, fixed costs, procurement, etc. to the most appropriate subactivity.

5. Provide for reporting of work which is consistent, objective and descriptive of what has been accomplished.

6. Provide for direct line manager review of proposed funding options against the workload model by subactivity.

7. Eliminate broad and vague descriptions of work as a basis for funding.

8. Not cost more to use, once implemented, than present approaches to the AWP.

D. THE PROPOSED APPLICATION

Each year, on receipt of the AWP the State Director (or the Associate SD if assigned budget responsibility) would remove 5% of the budget from each subactivity retaining this in a 0000 account at the State Office. The Associate State Director would then determine how much of the total budget to retain at USO. This would normally be approximately TO plus fixed costs, vehicle costs and basic procurement. (It is critical that line managers ensure dollars are not retained in excess of basic and minimum costs at this stage.) The remainder of the budget would then be distributed to the districts using a purely mathematical ratio developed from the resource area workload analysis for each subactivity. Each district would be considered as the sum of its resource areas. The budget would be handled similarly at the district level using the same workload analysis figures. The district would then provide the budget to the resource areas together with dollar amounts to use for planning work months and vehicle costs.

Once the budget reached the resource area level, the building of the AWP would begin. The Area Manager would prepare a work plan with the following guidelines:

1. The total dollars provided (all subactivities) may not be exceeded. It is likely that the total dollars provided at this point will be greater than the final AWP.

2. All work to be accomplished must be specifically identified and discussed in terms of a) the workload categories for the subactivity or b) as a short term add-on for a specific project.

3. Any requests for, or modifications of, funds in a subactivity which exceed or reduce those provided by more than 5% must be accompanied by a written justification of 1 paragraph.

4. The AWP submission must be completed within 3 full working days.

5. The AWP submission must include a spread of WMs by position, procurement and fixed costs by subactivity, planned vehicle costs (by vehicle and subactivity)and planned work in workload category units.

When the District Manager receives the submissions from the resource areas, the final submission for the District would be prepared using the same ground rules the areas used. The 5% threshold in item 3 above would apply both to the overall district budget by subactivity and to the relative proportions of that budget assigned to each resource area. Where written justifications are required (for deviations of more than 5% in any subactivity) in a resource area's portion of the district budget (relative to other resource areas) a copy would be provided to the appropriate Area Manager(s).

When the Associate State Director receives the district submissions, a final AWP would be formulated by the divisions using the same ground rules as the district and without using the 0000 account. The AWP would then be presented to the Associate State Director by subactivity and by district focusing on deviations from the base workload. Written justifications would be provided to the appropriate District Manager(s) and a final decision would be reached cooperatively by the affected District Manager(s) and the Associate State Director.

Each office level would be assigned 5% of its total budget as a 0000 account. The AM, DM and SD could use these dollars in whichever subactivity they felt their AWP was short. This would provide flexibility and promote accuracy in fund coding. At this point the AWP should be complete and would be distributed to all offices. By January 30 of the following year, the State Director should be provided with any planned modifications in the work to be performed. These may be used to make adjustments at mid year as necessary.

E. DISCUSSION

Budget is the primary mechanism integrating the activities of the state office, the districts and the resource areas in Utah. For this reason it must be an effective tool for planning work in a manner which delivers the greatest amount of benefit to the public land user and the taxpayer.

The proposed approach provides opportunities for more efficient management by:

1. encouraging accuracy and objectivity in cost coding and reporting,

2. providing a balance sheet approach relating inputs to output,

3. providing a system in which the line manager is directly involved and in which the basis for a decision is identifiable,

4. providing some predictability in year-to-year budgets,

5. providing sufficient flexibility to allow line managers to divert funding to short term workloads when justifiable,

6. providing greater efficiency in directing dollars to where they would be most effective in generating tangible benefits to the public,

There is one possible unwanted outcome. Managers may resist change, particularly as it affects TO. Changes in budget will eventually force reconsideration. If a manager continues to be unwilling to make necessary choices, decisions may need to be made at the next level up. This should only be done as a last resort, because the closer the manager is to the workload in question the more likely he/she is to understand the area (or district) workload and personnel. This understanding should lead to a better decision.

F. IMPLEMENTATION

A. There are 3 basic options for implementing an approach of this type: use a pilot, phase it in, or full implementation at one time.

1. Implementing a pilot program would involve selecting 2 to 5 subactivities and and using relative workload measures across the state to budget for those subactivities only. This approach has the advantage of allowing the system to be tested on a small scale before full implementation. This approach has the disadvantages of indefinitely a) delaying the full benefits which might be realized full implementation and b) favoring some public land users over others through inefficient placement of dollars (and program capability).

2. Phasing in the workload approach to budgeting would involve using the 1986 AWP as a baseline to compare with the budget which would have been generated by using workload measures. For each of the following 3 years, budgets in each subactivity would be adjusted by 1/3 of the difference expressed as a percentage. This approach has the advantage of allowing managers to make adjustments gradually over 3 years (which is likely to be less disruptive to personnel). This approach has the disadvantage of taking 3 years before the full benefits of cost-efficiency are realized.

3. Full and immediate implementation of the entire system would require the use of employee details to other offices and other measures to move employees quickly. At this point, it is difficult to determine how many employees or offices would be affected. This approach has the advantage of realizing cost efficiency benefits in the very near term. It has the disadvantage of being disruptive to personnel and possibly causing a drop in morale and productivity.

Wang 0024A
JKenna:jgk:6/17/86

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND WORKLOAD ANALYSIS

In the coming years, decreasing budgets in many subactivities will inevitably lead to some changes in Utah BLM's organizational structure and the number and type of positions that can be funded. Workload analysis can help identify those position and structural changes which would have the least adverse impact on our ability to function, meet the workload and provide quality service to the public.

A. Present obstacles (not all are inherently undesireable) to making the needed adjustments are:

1. There are no incentives for managers to phase out unneeded positions, consider using other than permanent full time positions or to use "dual hat" positions.

2. Some managers and employees are not convinced that major changes need to occur in their district or resource area. (It will occur elsewhere or I'll keep making my case and ride it out.)

3. Managers place a high value on protecting their present TO, including both occupied and unoccupied positions.

4. Some managers are more preoccupied with the number of permanent positions on their staff than whether the mix of positions (permanent/temporary, full time/part time) is efficient and productive.

5. Some managers and employees do not feel they can rely on demonstrated concern or support from their supervisors.

6. Competition among managers for positions and funding occurs without an objective, commonly accepted description of the workload in question.

B. GOALS:

1. To adjust staffing across Utah so it closely matches workload within 3 years of initiation.

2. To improve the team orientation of BLM managers in Utah.

3. To maintain employee morale.

C. OBJECTIVES:

1. Provide incentives for managers to adjust their operation to improve efficiency (eg.: evaluate staffing and create interdisciplinary position).

2. To develop a table of organization for each resource area and district office based strictly on workload measures before adjustments based on manager input.

3. To identify job opportunities (in high workload areas in Utah) within one year in order to provide opportunities to individuals whose positions may be in jeopardy elsewhere.

4. To provide recognition for managers who promote efficiency and productivity based on an objective and recognized performance standard.

5. To encourage manager and employee participation in determining how workload is measured.

6. To set up formalized employee/supervisor counselling sessions to review the proposed long term TO and discuss career options.

7. To prepare an all-employee presentation on directions the bureau is taking (patterned after some of the presentations at the M&L Workshop). Incorporate information on the workload analysis and deliver it at all offices.

D. THE PROPOSED APPLICATION

Workload analysis could be used to identify locations where dual hatting is appropriate. It also may indicate that temporary positions could be more effectively used to accomplish seasonal workloads in some subactivities and in some offices. It may indicate that some permanent positions need to be moved to another location. These applications are difficult to second guess until the workload analysis is complete. That analysis will certainly create a better information base from which to make these judgements.

A standardized, budget and staff related, critical PIPR element should be developed for all Area Managers (and one for District Managers) which incorporates an efficiency measure using budget and workload accomplished (by subactivity?) as part of the performance standard. The performance standards in the PIPR should also include a qualitative assessment of work accomplished and of the way in which personnel were managed. Cash awards should be considered for any Level II manager who has exceeded efficiency standards.

The last 3 objectives are based on the principle that people will respond more positively if 1) positive action is taken to demonstrate individual concern, 2) they are kept informed and 3) they are given an opportunity to be a part of the action.

NOTE: This narrative will need to be expanded later in the project.

JKenna:jgk:6/18/86
Wang 0034A